



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/733,798	12/11/2003	N. Isaac Rajkumar	VIGN1640-1	8964

44654 7590 01/03/2006

SPRINKLE IP LAW GROUP
1301 W. 25TH STREET
SUITE 408
AUSTIN, TX 78705

EXAMINER

PATEL, HETUL B

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2186

DATE MAILED: 01/03/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/733,798	Applicant(s) RAJKUMAR ET AL.	
	Examiner Hetul Patel	Art Unit 2186	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 03 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 March 2005.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-35 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 11 December 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>03/29/04, 08/12/04, 08/27/04, 09/02/04, 01/25/05, 03/07/05.</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-35 are presented for examination.
2. The IDS filed on 03/29/2004, 08/20/2004, 08/27/2004, 09/02/2004, 01/25/2005, and 03/07/2005 have been received and carefully considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

3. Claims 5 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Claims 5 and 22 recite the limitation "the request" in line 2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in both claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

4. Claims 1-9, 15-17, 18-26 and 32-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Shen (USPN: 5,946,697).

As per claim 1, Shen teaches a method for caching comprising registering a module (i.e. the macro definition file); evaluating a parameter (i.e. macro name file) of a request, wherein the parameter is evaluated by the module; creating a signature (i.e. the macro compressed file) based on the evaluation; searching for responsive content (i.e. the changed HTML file content/portion) in a cache based on the signature; and generating responsive content and storing it in the cache if no responsive content is found in the cache (i.e. transmitting the changed HTML file content from the server location to the client location) (e.g. see Col. 2, line 57 – Col. 3, line 21).

As per claim 2, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the method further comprising receiving a request (e.g. see Col. 3, lines 35-40).

As per claim 3, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the method further comprising delivering the responsive content to an originator of the request (e.g. see Col. 3, lines 45-46).

As per claim 4, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the method further comprising registering a template (i.e. the macro definition file) (e.g. see Col. 2, line 65 – Col. 3, line 2).

As per claim 5, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the method further comprising associating the request with the template (i.e. the macro definition file) (e.g. see Col. 2, line 65 – Col. 3, line 2).

As per claim 6, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the method further comprising the parameter (i.e. the

macro name file) is defined by the template (i.e. the macro definition file) (e.g. see Col. 2, line 65 – Col. 3, line 2).

As per claim 7, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the method further comprising extracting data related to the parameter from the request; and passing the data to the module, i.e. the macro compressed file, which indicates the changes made to the changed HTML portion relative to the HTML file cached at the client location, is generated at the server location and passed/transmitted to the client location from the server location (e.g. see Col. 3, lines 5-14).

As per claim 8, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the parameter (i.e. the macro name file) is a form data and a java bean (e.g. see Col. 6, lines 41-53).

As per claim 9, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the signature (i.e. the macro compressed file) is formed from the module's evaluation (i.e. the evaluation of the macro definition file) (e.g. see Col. 3, lines 5-7).

As per claim 15, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the method further comprising storing template metadata (i.e. macro name file) and request metadata (i.e. the macro compressed file) in the cache, wherein the template metadata and request metadata are associated with the responsive content (i.e. the changed HTML file content/portion) (e.g. see Col. 2, line 57 – Col. 3, line 21).

As per claim 16, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the request metadata (i.e. the macro compressed file) is formed from the module's evaluation (e.g. see Col. 2, line 57 – Col. 3, line 21).

As per claim 17, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Shen teaches that the request metadata (i.e. macro name file) is a list or a hash table (i.e. the list of macro names) (e.g. see Col. 2, line 57 – Col. 3, line 21).

As per claims 18-26 and 32-34, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1-9 and 15-17, respectively. Shen teaches the software system having machine/computer readable media (i.e. the memory medium) containing machine instructions, which when executed cause to implement functions that are generally consistent with the steps of the method of claims 1-9 and 15-17 (e.g. see Col. 3, lines 54-60). Claims 18-26 and 32-34 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 1-9 and 15-17, respectively.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 10-14, 27-31 and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen in view of Bradley et al. (USPN: 2002/0194219) hereinafter, Bradley.

As per claim 10, Shen teaches the claimed invention as described above.

However, Shen does not teach the further limitation that the parameter and the module pertain to capabilities of a browser initiating the request. Bradley, on the other hand, teaches that the server delivers a form and renders it in the format that best matches the presentation and form filling capabilities of the target browser, i.e. the browser initiating the request (e.g. see paragraphs [0109] and [0270]). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skilled in the art at the time of the current invention was made to implement the teachings of Bradley in the method taught by Shen. In doing so, instead of presenting the data in one standard/default way, for example, font size, color, background color, etc., the data will appear on the browser as it is preferred by the user who initiated the request (e.g. see paragraph [0110]).

As per claim 11, the combination of Shen and Bradley teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Bradley teaches that the parameter is a user-agent string extracted from a header in the request (see paragraph [0280]).

As per claim 12, the combination of Shen and Bradley teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Bradley teaches that the module evaluates the capabilities of the browser using an extensible markup language file (e.g. see paragraph [0017]).

As per claim 13, the combination of Shen and Bradley teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Bradley teaches that the the extensible markup language file defines a list of rules which map the user-agent string to a list of browser capabilities (see paragraph [0281]-[0282]).

As per claim 14, the combination of Shen and Bradley teaches the claimed invention as described above and furthermore, Bradley teaches that the list of rules may be expanded, i.e. the list/table gets longer as the browser capabilities for a particular client/browser is increased (e.g. see paragraph [0281]).

As per claims 27-31, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 10-14, respectively. The combination of Shen and Bradley teaches the software system having machine/computer readable media (i.e. the memory medium) containing machine instructions, which when executed cause to implement functions that are generally consistent with the steps of the method of claims 10-14 (e.g. see Shen Col. 3, lines 54-60). Claims 27-31 are also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 10-14, respectively.

As per claim 35, see arguments with respect to the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 12. Claim 35 is also rejected based on the same rationale as the rejection of claims 1, 10 and 12.

Conclusion


6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hetul Patel whose telephone number is 571-272-4184. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8-4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Matt Kim can be reached on 571-272-4182. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

HBP
HBP


MATTHEW KIM
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER